

Cannery Station – April 9, 2019

PC 18 33 PUD 02 – Cannery Station, Phase I Final Planned Unit Development (PUD)

PC 18 34 SUB 01 – Cannery Station, Tentative Subdivision (SUB)

PC 18 35 DR 03 – Assisted Living Facility

PC 18 40 DR 08 – Transitional Cottage Fourplex #1

PC 18 41 DR 09 – Transitional Cottage Fourplex #2

#### EXHIBIT I – ADDITIONAL REFERRALS

**From:** Matt Wadlington [mailto:mwadlington@civilwest.net]

**Sent:** Wednesday, March 27, 2019 10:12 AM

**To:** Mike Miller <mike.miller@ci.florence.or.us>

**Cc:** Aric Farnsworth <afarnsworth@civilwest.net>

**Subject:** Response to comments for Cannery Station

Good morning Mike,

The following is our response to the comments received by the City for the Cannery Station development.

1. The "slit" trench on the eastern property which was shown on sheet C3.0 only extends south ~200 feet, not all the way to the south property line. The primary purpose for the trench as stated, was to direct overflow from Florentine Estates. Per the topography there is an overflow onto the Cannery Estates property, but the topo is circa 2008, so if work was done since then, then it isn't shown. The previously proposed trench would not intercept runoff from basin C which is on the south side of the property. Outlet of pond A is on the north side of the pond (south side of Munsel Lake Rd) and is at an elevation 1 foot lower than the top of the bank on the east side. If the reason for the trench was to direct offsite water, and as Florentine Estates is saying there is no offsite water, then there shouldn't be a need for the ditch.

**Recommendation: Approve as submitted.**

2. The development, per the plans will create a barrier to stop flow from existing the property on the east side and will increase the elevation by ~4' to ensure the flow goes north.

**Recommendation: Approve as submitted.**

3. We understand the reasoning for the developer to utilize the same version as was used in the original analysis, and recognize that the model used was not the same, nor was it current. The expected difference in the outcome of the different versions for this area would not be significant.

**Recommendation: Approve as submitted.**

4. Development in the City should, by default, be done in a manner which prevents failure. I don't think adding such a condition would change that. In fact, adding a requirement for specific "fail proof design" would imply that other areas may be allowed to fail. However, making the construction of the berm of a material which is NOT pervious, such as clay, or a HDPE liner, would prevent infiltration through the berm and onto neighboring properties.

**Recommendation: Approve with Condition that perimeter sides of drainage basins/ponds shall be constructed with a non/low-permeable material.**

Please let me know if you have any additional questions or concerns.

-Matt

**Matt Wadlington, PE**, Willamette Valley Regional Manager d

541.982.4373 | c 520.444.4220

**Civil West Engineering Services, Inc.**

213 Water Ave. NW, Suite 100, Albany, OR 97322

p 541.223.5130

[www.civilwest.com](http://www.civilwest.com)



Exhibit I1.5

**From:** [Mike Miller](#)  
**To:** [Wendy Farley-Campbell](#)  
**Cc:** [Glen Southerland](#); [Dylan Huber-Heidorn](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Cannery Station and Ped Crossing Requirement  
**Date:** Friday, March 8, 2019 11:25:50 AM

---

FYI

---

**From:** BERMAN Jenna [mailto:[Jenna.BERMAN@odot.state.or.us](mailto:Jenna.BERMAN@odot.state.or.us)]  
**Sent:** Friday, March 08, 2019 11:23 AM  
**To:** Mike Miller <[mike.miller@ci.florence.or.us](mailto:mike.miller@ci.florence.or.us)>  
**Cc:** BAUMGARTNER Douglas G <[Douglas.G.BAUMGARTNER@odot.state.or.us](mailto:Douglas.G.BAUMGARTNER@odot.state.or.us)>; UPTON Dorothy J <[Dorothy.J.UPTON@odot.state.or.us](mailto:Dorothy.J.UPTON@odot.state.or.us)>; MONTES Mariana <[Mariana.MONTES@odot.state.or.us](mailto:Mariana.MONTES@odot.state.or.us)>; NELSON Brian S \* Scott <[Brian.S.NELSON@odot.state.or.us](mailto:Brian.S.NELSON@odot.state.or.us)>  
**Subject:** RE: Cannery Station and Ped Crossing Requirement

Hello Mike,

I received some input from our traffic folks. Region 2 Traffic could potentially support an enhanced pedestrian crossing at this location which would likely include a median island and an RRFB as an appropriate crossing treatment given this facility and the roadway characteristics. With this many apartments directly across from a Fred Meyer, a crossing would likely generate some level of need. Keep in mind that if this is pursued, it would have to be approved by the State Traffic Roadway Engineer (STRE) who could also add additional requirements.

Thanks for the inquiry and let us know if you have any other questions or if you want to officially pursue STRE approval.

Jenna

**\*New office schedule and location:** I am in Corvallis Tuesday-Friday and Salem on Mondays. Please call my cell phone (971-719-6024) to contact me and note my new primary office address below.

**Jenna Berman**

ODOT Region 2, Active Transportation Liaison  
Corvallis & Salem Offices  
3700 SW Philomath Blvd  
Corvallis, OR 97333  
C: 971.719.6024  
[Jenna.berman@odot.state.or.us](mailto:Jenna.berman@odot.state.or.us)

**From:** [BAUMGARTNER Douglas G](#)  
**To:** [Wendy Farley-Campbell](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Cannery Station-Updated TIA 1-23-19  
**Date:** Friday, March 8, 2019 10:27:43 AM

---

Good morning Wendy,

Here are the comments from our TIA reviewers on the latest edit. They mirror the comments sent for the Sand Pines Ranch TIA. Feel free to contact me if you have or receive any further questions.

Thanks,

Doug

Douglas Baumgartner, P.E.  
Region 2 Development Review Coordinator  
Oregon Department of Transportation  
455 Airport Rd SE, Bldg. B | Salem, OR 97301  
Office: 503.986.5806 | Cell: 503.798.5793

---

**From:** BLAIR Keith P  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 07, 2019 9:18 AM  
**To:** BAUMGARTNER Douglas G  
**Cc:** UPTON Dorothy J  
**Subject:** RE: Cannery Station-Updated TIA 1-23-19

Doug:

From what I can gather on the history of this one, this TIA response/update looks good. I believe the only comment Region Traffic still has is that we recommend to provide adequate storage lengths to accommodate the 95<sup>th</sup> percentile queue length in build year 2028 for:

1. US-101 @ Munsel Lake Road – provide separate westbound left- and right-turn lanes
2. US-101 @ 47<sup>th</sup> Street (proposed) – provide separate westbound left- and right-turn lanes with at least 125' and 225' of storage length, respectively.

Please let me know if there are any questions or anything further needed. Thanks!

**Keith P. Blair, P.E.**

**Senior Transportation Analyst | ODOT Region 2**  
455 Airport Road SE, Bldg. A | Salem, Oregon 97301  
(503) 986-2857 | [Keith.P.Blair@odot.state.or.us](mailto:Keith.P.Blair@odot.state.or.us)

**ODOT's mission is to provide a safe and reliable multimodal transportation system that connects people and helps Oregon's communities and economy thrive.**

**From:** [Wendy Farley-Campbell](#)  
**To:** [Wendy Farley-Campbell](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Cannery Station and Ped Crossing Requirement  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 3, 2019 7:02:09 PM

---

----- Original message -----

From: BERMAN Jenna <[Jenna.BERMAN@odot.state.or.us](mailto:Jenna.BERMAN@odot.state.or.us)>  
Date: 4/2/19 3:10 PM (GMT-08:00)  
To: Mike Miller <[mike.miller@ci.florence.or.us](mailto:mike.miller@ci.florence.or.us)>  
Subject: RE: Cannery Station and Ped Crossing Requirement

From Scott Nelson related to ADA needs and retirement homes:

*For what it's worth, Pam Johnson and I reviewed 9 wheelchair fatalities working in the ADA program last year & found that 2 of them were directly at assisted living facilities. These were accidents that happened over the last 5 or so years. We didn't have data to confirm if the victims were living at the facilities, but it seemed likely.*

From Dorothy Upton about the RRFB:

*We are talking about an enhanced crossing not just a Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons (PHB). An enhanced crossing is markings, signs, islands, curb extensions and active pedestrian devices. Based on this segment being a higher speed, multi-lane facilities with pedestrian generators on both sides of the highway Region 2 Traffic can support and recommend an enhanced crossing here.*

*The section that Kelly is citing from the MUTCD is a statement under Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons (PHB) and does not include RRFB's. The PHB has a threshold since it physically stops via a red indication while the RRFB does not since it is only a warning device. We can support an RRFB at this location for the following reasons:*

- *This is a higher speed facility (over 30 MPH).*
- *This is a multi-lane facility where there is the threat of vehicles blocking sight of pedestrians.*
- *There is a bus stop in this segment that will draw pedestrians.*
- *Having Fred Meyer on the west side is also a pedestrian draw.*
- *Pedestrian usage of an enhanced crossing is not dependent on peak hour traffic volumes which are assumed to be weekday pm. This location will likely have usage outside of that period.*
- *I disagree with the statement that the "assisted living is not anticipated to generate pedestrians ....on a consistent basis" - What about employees/care givers that may want to have a nice walk over to the store to get lunch or just a few items.*

*We also need to consider that this is only Phase 1 so there will be more generation in the future. If the City wanted to condition changes to the phases, then perhaps all the*

*improvements (markings, signs, islands and/or curb extensions) with a future RRFB conditioned.*

*My stance, though, is that there will be a need for an enhanced crossing as pedestrians will just be darting across the highway. I don't think that a PHB is the way to go, but a crossing with median island and RRFB's is appropriate. We have done this in other cases, most recently for an apartment complex in the fringe of Philomath that was tagged for the cost of installation of the RRFB and then the City of Philomath is handling the maintenance and operations.*

*Hopefully this helps.*

**Dorothy J. Upton, P.E.**

ODOT Region 2 Traffic Operations Engineer

455 Airport Road, SE Building A

Salem, OR 97301-5397

Office: 503-986-5761

[dorothy.j.upton@odot.state.or.us](mailto:dorothy.j.upton@odot.state.or.us)

**\*New office schedule and location:** I am in Corvallis Tuesday-Friday and Salem on Mondays.

Please call my cell phone (971-719-6024) to contact me and note my new primary office address below.

**Jenna Berman**

ODOT Region 2, Active Transportation Liaison

Corvallis & Salem Offices

3700 SW Philomath Blvd

Corvallis, OR 97333

C: 971.719.6024

[jenna.berman@odot.state.or.us](mailto:jenna.berman@odot.state.or.us)